BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 08654 257 6

No. 7588.267

THE TRUSTEES OF THE
PUBLIC LIBRARY
OMNIVM
LVX
CIVIVM
OF THE CITY OF
BOSTON
1852 1878

LETTER

FROM L. M. SARGENT

TO

REV. JOHN MARSH.

H 588.267

BOSTON, MARCH 11, 1847.

REV. JOHN MARSH, *Sec. Am. Temp. Union.*

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

Through the civility of Mr. John Tappan, I have now before me a printed handbill, or circular, directed to him, by Mr. E. C. Delavan, containing a letter to you, from R. H. Walworth, Esquire, President of the American Temperance Union, giving his opinion of your strictures upon the lectures of Dr. Nott.

There is a court of dernier resort, in which the strong common sense of an enlightened people presides, as chancellor, admirably adapted for the decision of such questions as the present. Let us refer this matter to that high tribunal.

I have been favoured with a letter, from Dr. Nott, in which he says we have "*misunderstood*" him. In such case he means to say that he agrees with us, that it is unjustifiable for a total abstinence man to drink any liquor, as a beverage, which contains any alcohol, however little the quantity; for, though it may not intoxicate, it is a violation of the spirit of the temperance pledge, and leads into temptation. If such is Dr. Nott's opinion, Mr. Delavan will render a greater service, by scattering this simple statement, appended to the lectures, than he is now achieving, by the publication of the handbill, which lies before me.

From fph vol 161
2/454
July 1, 1858.

Mr. Walworth expresses a hope, at the close of his letter, that you will publish the communications of those gentlemen, in the journal of the Union. It would be unjust not to publish them, if they are of reasonable length. *Lex non cogit ad impossibilia*, to be sure; and if the journal will not hold them, you have a sensible excuse.

He also says he should deeply deplore the occurrence of any thing, which would fix upon the public mind the unfounded belief, that there are any differences in principle, between the executive committee and officers of the American Temperance Union, and Dr. Nott. If we have *misunderstood* Dr. Nott, no differences exist: but we shall presently exercise the right of showing how very naturally we were led to *misunderstand* him. A full, fair, and free discussion is not more essential to the permanent adjustment of all differences, than a little fermentation to the perfection of *tirosh*.

Mr. Walworth thinks you have erred in supposing the lectures are "*not calculated greatly to aid us, in persuading others to abstain totally, from the use, as a beverage, of every thing that can intoxicate.*" I can find no support for this opinion among the friends of temperance, in this quarter. I read your strictures attentively, and the lectures twice, with a strong hope, that I might find you were mistaken. My respect for Dr. Nott is very sincere, and very high. I love not Cæsar less, but Rome more. In my humble opinion, these lectures, going into the world, without any comment, without any corrective criticism, and with the endorsement of the President of the American Temperance Union, would produce infinitely more harm than advantage to the reformation.

Mr. Walworth proceeds to support his opinion, by a reference to the fact, that there are many pious men, among the clergy and laity, who do not understand how it can be wrong to use, as a beverage, that, which God commended as good, and this, he thinks, is owing to their ignorance of the difference between *yayin* and *tirosh*. Mr. Walworth fondly anticipates that a perusal of these lectures will set them right.

I find myself wholly behind Mr. Walworth, in that charity, which believeth all things. I firmly believe, that, if all the wine-drinking bishops, priests, and deacons, and pious laymen in the United States, could be duly instructed, by Dr. Nott, in the true difference, between *yayin* and *tirosh*, and each one of them be furnished, by Mr. Delavan, with a copy of the lectures, the habits of very, very few would undergo the slightest modification. I as firmly believe, that the perusal of certain portions of these lectures, to which I shall presently refer—the meaning and intention of Dr. Nott to the contrary notwithstanding—will relieve the consciences of not a few, among the wine-drinking clergy and laity, and teach the world to look upon the temperance pledge, as an affair of little consequence, since they have it from high authority, that its violation is a common affair. That such authority exists, in these lectures, we shall presently demonstrate. The evil, they may produce, will probably be somewhat greater than the good, which will result from instructing the clergy and pious laity, as to the relative characters of *yayin* and *tirosh*.

Mr. Walworth says he has recently decided, that liquors, which will not intoxicate, cannot be considered intoxicating liquors; but that liquors, which contain alcohol enough to intoxicate, in isolated cases, or by the use of excessive quantity, are intoxicating liquors. And these last, he says, should be avoided by Christians, as well as by the friends of temperance. And does Mr. Walworth mean to say, that the first class, which contains alcohol, but not enough to intoxicate, is not also to be avoided, by total abstinence men? ! What *nova progenies* of temperance is here! If this inference be just, and this opinion should be sustained, the pledge of your Society is of little worth. As a member of that Society, I have considered myself bound, by the spirit of my pledge, to abstain from every beverage, containing alcohol, however small the quantity. A very little rum in a large quantity of water will not intoxicate, in the common or unphilosophical meaning of that word. This then is not an intoxicating li-

quor! Mr. Walworth says, "*the friends of temperance are not contending for impracticable theories:*" I am not so confident, that some of them are not. For all the practical purposes of the reformation, I can not imagine a more impracticable theory, than that, which teaches total abstinence men, that, consistently with their pledge, they may use, as a beverage, any liquor, a component part whereof is alcohol, however small the quantity, *provided it will not intoxicate.* What a proviso is this, for a miscellaneous world! I have often wished that all our clergy and pious laity had an inspired apostle at their elbows, to tell them *when, and how little* wine should be taken, for their stomach's sake. It will be quite as desirable, for every total abstinence man to have a chancellor at hand, to inform him whether his beverage is an intoxicating liquor or not.

But let us not forget the primary question—what is intoxication? Formerly no man was considered intoxicated, unless he was drunk! No man was held to be the "worse for liquor," until after his third removal from the gutter. What are inebriants? They are well defined to be "such things, as affect the nerves, in a particular and agreeable manner, and, through them, alter and disturb the functions of the mind." Who will say, that *any* quantity of alcohol will not produce this effect, in some degree, though unobserved by others?

Mr. Walworth remarks, referring to fermentation, "*the dividing line, between such imperfectly fermented liquors, as can and do produce inebriation, and such as cannot possibly intoxicate any one, until the process of fermentation is further advanced, cannot be discovered and defined by human science.*" Can a more significant argument be constructed, and sent forth, *ex cathedra*, to assure mankind, that their only safety can be found, in total abstinence from every liquor, as a beverage, which contains the slightest particle of alcohol? It is clear that the *tirosh* of to-day may be *yayin* to-morrow—that slightly fermented liquor, for which nobody is "*the*

worse," and which only renders one rather garrulous—*vires acquirens eundo*, that is, by increasing fermentation, may very speedily convert him into an uncomfortable inmate; and, gradually wearing out its welcome with a tired stomach, and failing any longer to "affect the nerves, in an agreeable manner," urge forward the appetite to that, which will—to more potent liquors—to brandy and to rum. As it is impossible for human science to discover the *dii termini*, the boundary lines, between that, which is sufficiently fermented to intoxicate, and that, which is not, we cannot but admire the superior tact of the Jews, who so readily distinguished, between their *yayin* and *tirosh!* If human science cannot discover these boundary lines, by what process, for practical purposes, shall we be enabled to draw a line, of universal application, and intelligible to all, between those *alcoholic* liquors, which a *total abstinence* man may use, as a beverage, and those which he may not?! Mr. A. is a maker and vender of root beer. It is a fermented liquor, and, necessarily, contains alcohol; but it is very little, and it has been decided, in the court of dernier resort, that it is not an *intoxicating liquor*. It is therefore an appropriate beverage, for those *total abstinence* men, who are not contented with water. The sale is brisk, and Mr. A. soon has a successful competitor, in Mr. B. whose root beer is found to be decidedly superior; so much so, that several of his *total abstinence* customers become intoxicated. They solemnly protest they have drunk nothing, unauthorized by the court of dernier resort. Mr. B. solemnly asserts, that he has added no distilled alcohol. Thus total abstinence men, Mr. B., his beer, and the court of dernier resort are brought under censure. But the court will say, "here are the isolated cases;" this is an intoxicating liquor, and must be abandoned. Now it is highly probable, that Mr. B., desirous of making his beer popular and effective, enforced it with added alcohol. The educt of distillation would, no doubt, give a high per centage, for beer; but he would still protest, and detail the superiority of his materials, and of his manner

of extracting their virtues. This is one of many illustrations of the embarrassment, which must attend our operations, if we recognize the right of men, pledged to total abstinence, to use, as a beverage, any liquor, alcoholic in the slightest degree. There is no life-boat, by which, under the providence of God, this glorious experiment can be saved from destruction, and carried forward successfully, but the pledge of abstinence from alcohol, as a beverage, in every form, and in every quantity. If we differ in this, the sooner the fact is known the better. If we agree, and the phraseology of our pledge is not as extensive as our meaning, let it be altered, to express that meaning. Nothing can be more simple, nothing more complete and effective, than the principle of total abstinence, so understood. Instead of a system of experiments with small tipple, which may or may not intoxicate, according to circumstances, and in regard to which, we are liable to gross imposition ; in this pledge we have a master key, which locks every door of temptation. The progress of intemperance is commonly from beer to rum, and very rarely from rum to beer. By adopting the pledge of total abstinence from alcohol, in every form, and in every quantity, instead of permitting the adversary to creep upon us unawares, we take the initiative, in this holy war against man, to save him from himself.

After the reception of the letter, above referred to, from Dr. Nott, for whom I have ever felt and expressed the highest respect, it was my intention to send you a brief communication, for your journal, simply expressive of the high satisfaction I felt, at the declaration from him, that we had *misunderstood* him. I was prepared to take, in common with Dr. Chapin, yourself, and every individual with whom I have conversed, in regard to the probable effect of these lectures, my full share of the charge of stolidity. But Mr. E. C. Delavan has deemed it expedient to obtain a copy of Mr. Walworth's letter, in reply to you, and to give it extensive publicity. I discover nothing, in this letter, to change my

opinion, and something to confirm that opinion, as presented, in my letter, written in answer to yours, and published in your journal. Mr. E. C. Delavan's course has induced me to relinquish my design, and to look at the matter more attentively.

Mr. Walworth remarks, that, "*to understand the force and probable benefits of the doctor's lectures upon the temperance cause, they must be considered together as a whole.*" The question is not, what will be the effect of these lectures upon an "*unprejudiced*" mind, to use Mr. Walworth's expression. The advocates of temperance have occasion to deal, more frequently, with *prejudiced* minds, and should therefore be extremely careful in their phraseology. Many will scan these lectures, ten in number, with a view of finding sentiments in accordance with their wishes; and comparatively few will read them all, and consider them "*together as a whole.*" Here then, in a nutshell, lies our difficulty. In the very commencement of these lectures, and in some of the first in order, there are passages, which cannot fail to be very acceptable to the opponents of total abstinence, and extremely offensive to its friends. These passages are calculated to give comfort to the moderate drinkers of wine, and cast an air of laxity over the doctrines and discipline of temperance, exceedingly painful to those—not a few I trust—who have been faithful to their pledge, and, as I verily believe, unjustifiable, in point of fact. I ascribe not to their venerable author the slightest intention to misrepresent. He says, as I have stated, that we have *misunderstood* him. There is a misunderstanding somewhere. Whether on his part, or on ours, the friends of temperance must determine. The exhortations to total abstinence are frequently and fervently repeated, especially in the concluding lectures, and present a contrast, which it is absolutely difficult to reconcile, in view of the obnoxious passages, to which I have referred. Even Mr. Walworth is of the opinion, that these lectures might have been injurious to the cause of temperance, had

their author stopped at a certain point. It must not be forgotten, that every man is not a chancellor; and that there are readers, not a few, who *will stop* at that very point. The insertion of Mr. Walworth's words will prevent misapprehension: "*The lectures of the Doctor would have been imperfect, however, and might have been injurious to the cause of temperance, if they had stopped with the establishment of the distinction, between good wine, which the Bible commends, as a blessing, and intoxicating wine, which it denounces, as a curse.*" I am unable to discover, in the concomitant exhortations to total abstinence from "*intoxicating liquors,*" or in any part of these lectures, to the close, any authority for Mr. Walworth's opinion, that these lectures are calculated "*greatly to aid us in persuading others to abstain totally from the use, as a beverage, of anything that can intoxicate.*" For, it must not be forgotten, that Mr. Walworth has decided, in the court of dernier resort, that there are *alcoholic* liquors which are not *intoxicating*. This decision may be correct or not, according as we adopt the *popular* or the *philosophical* construction of that word. But whichever we adopt, our opinion of the effect of these lectures must remain unchanged, so long as we believe, that the use of *alcoholic* liquors, though they may not *intoxicate*, in the *popular* sense, will ever prove a stepping stone to mischief, and greatly retard the progress of the reformation; for, though such liquors may not intoxicate, in the *popular* sense, they notoriously, ever have, and ever will, lead thousands and tens of thousands to the use of that, which will intoxicate, in every sense. Therefore, however these lectures, in Mr. Walworth's opinion, may aid us, in persuading others to abstain totally from everything, that can *intoxicate*, still, if they afford the slightest comfort or countenance to the practice of drinking any *alcoholic* liquor, we assert that their tendency is to evil, and regret their publication. But it is quite time to exhibit the evidence, in support of our opinion, that the friends of temperance may be enabled to decide, how far we are likely

to be aided by these lectures, in advancing the cause of total abstinence ;· and whether we are chargeable with uncommon dullness of apprehension.

The first quotation, which we offer, is as follows: "Although we neither use nor abet the use, even the moderate use of intoxicating liquor, in any of its forms, as a beverage, still we do not know, and dare not therefore affirm, that they who do use it, in some of them, are on that account, greater sinners than other men." Taken alone, we tender no issue upon this passage. Perceiving no very cogent reason for the statement, it struck us, as wearing rather an ad captandum appearance, and tended to support, in some slight degree, our opinion of the probable effect of these lectures upon the common mind.

The next passage, to which we invite attention is this: "Indeed, if the moderate, and especially the occasional use of intoxicating liquor, in some of its forms, is to exclude from our charity and fellowship, it will be difficult to find, even among our own members, executioners, without sin, to cast at their offending neighbor the first stone." This also has a popular aspect. Whatever gloss or interpretation may be cast over this passage, its true construction cannot be mistaken. There is surely no ambiguity, latent or patent. Our venerable friend will be understood to say, that, among the members of total abstinence societies, it would be difficult to find individuals, who have not violated the pledge, by the moderate and occasional use of intoxicating liquor, in some of its forms. This assertion is eminently calculated to do harm. It teaches the friends of temperance and the world, that the violation of the temperance pledge is a common affair, and thus, weakening the force of moral obligation, leads our associates to follow the multitude, and do evil. I must here, most solemnly, say, that I believe this assertion to be incorrect. The first stone may be lawfully cast, by the author of these lectures. He has told us, in the first passage, above selected from his lectures, that he does not use, even moderate-

ly, intoxicating liquor, in any of its forms. If stones are to be cast, I am perfectly ready to cast the second. Opium, tobacco, *et id genus omne*, I have never used, in any of their forms, at any period of my life: and, since I subscribed the total abstinence pledge, many years ago, I have never used, as a beverage, any liquor, which contained a particle of alcohol. If two executioners are found so readily, I have not the vanity to suppose they stand alone. Sir, I have no more doubt, that thousands may be found, who have conscientiously and strictly adhered to their pledge, than I doubt the purity of your motives, and the propriety of your conduct, in criticising these lectures of Dr. Nott.

We proceed to another passage: after shewing the distinction between *tirosh* and *yayin*, the good and the bad wine, mentioned in the Old Testament, the lecturer proceeds to say: "Here then, on this broad distinction, between good and bad wine, recognized in the sacred writings, we take our stand. And be it remembered, it is not against the moderate use (in ordinary times) of good healthful wine, which the Bible sanctions, and employs, as an emblem of mercy; but against bad, deleterious wine, which the Bible reprobates, and employs, as an emblem of wrath, that we array ourselves." The lecturer wishes it to be remembered, that he does not array himself against the moderate use of good, healthful wine, which the Bible sanctions. He will not be understood, whatever may have been his intention, as writing, in reference to the past, but, as a lecturer on total abstinence, *at the present day*. Well—let us next inquire what was the character of this wine? Dr. Nott styles it *unfermented*, for the purposes of discussion, but says it was partially *fermented*, and contained *alcohol*. Let us give the words of the lecturer: "By UNFERMENTED wine, therefore, as used, in this discussion, is meant wine that has undergone no artificial, or other, or further fermentation, than what ordinarily takes place in the vat, and the press, and sometimes, perhaps, even in the cluster. Such wine, though not always entirely free from

alcohol, contains but little of that element, and that little so modified, by the remaining saccharine matter, with which it exists in admixture, as to prevent its producing intoxication, even though used freely and to the extent required for a beverage." And now the statement stands thus: Doctor Nott wishes it to be remembered, that he does not array himself against the moderate use of good, healthful wine, containing alcohol, but in so small a quantity, that it will not intoxicate. No subsequent profluvium of exhortation to total abstinence can neutralize the influence of this statement upon the common mind. Will Mr. Walworth, who says "*the friends of temperance are not contending for impracticable theories*," be so very obliging as to inform us, what sort of a theory is here! Will not such a theory as this keep forever in motion, on its hinges, that door of temptation, which the theory of total abstinence from every liquor, as a beverage, containing alcohol, in any quantity, would effectually close? Who does not perceive, that this theory, by a perfectly justifiable parity of reasoning, is applicable to every other beverage, containing alcohol? The cider-drinker will rally to the standard of such *total abstinence* as this. His fractious beverage has exacerbated his temper, and rendered him a domestic nuisance—but he always knows what he is about. *The saccharine matter, with which the alcohol exists in admixture*, prevents intoxication. He is never intoxicated. Even the rum-drinker is delighted to believe the great gulph, between himself and the total abstinence man, is becoming so very narrow, that he may, sooner or later, step over, and be received into fellowship, rum-jug and all. And why not? He is exceedingly careful, in the use of his beverage—it is but *a little*—the argument of old—it is but *a little*—abundantly diluted—and bountifully sugared, for he has unlimited confidence in the *saccharine matter!*

Dr. Nott remarks: "If we procure the best articles in our power, it is all that can be required of us; and it is only those articles, which contain deleterious ingredients, in such

quantity, or such proportion, as produce disease of body or mind, the use of which is to be avoided." This passage is immediately preceded, by this remarkable observation: "It is enough if wine be placed on the same footing as other articles of diet, with respect to each of which, the question, in relation to deleterious qualities, is a question of degree and not of totality." Now it appears to me, that language of more mischievous tendency could not possibly be addressed to the friends of temperance.

Again: "Wine, in which its (*entire*) saccharine matter has been converted, by continuous fermentation, into alcohol, may be highly exciting and deleterious; and, at the same time, wine, in which the process of fermentation is inceptive merely, and in which a small portion of its saccharine matter has been so converted, may be nutritious and healthful."

It can not be necessary, though perfectly easy, to multiply these passages, for the purpose of establishing the fact, that, according to our understanding of the principle of total abstinence, these lectures contain sentiments, whose promulgation would be mischievous, in their tendency. In this opinion there appears to be a remarkable concurrence, among the intelligent friends of the reformation here. If we have misunderstood Dr. Nott, the mental opthalmia is becoming a perfect epidemic. The structure of these paragraphs is sufficiently simple. There can be no doubt as to their import, under any known laws of construction. *Dr. Nott* may have been *misunderstood.* Undoubtedly he has been, for he asserts the fact; but the meaning of these paragraphs has *not been misunderstood.* Wonderful it may be; but, rather than impute an utter inability to understand their vernacular tongue to so many individuals, of education and sound discernment, it may seem more rational to seek a solution, in the very first line of that pleasant song, to which we have so often listened, in the days of our youth:

"How imperfect is expression!"

Even Mr. Walworth agrees, as we have already stated,

that these lectures might have been injurious to the cause of temperance, had they stopped at a certain point. That Dr. Nott and the public may have the full benefit of Mr. Walworth's opinion, we give the closing passage of his letter: "*I believe that every unprejudiced man, who reads these lectures attentively, especially every believer in the divine authority of the Bible, will arise from their perusal as good, if not a better friend of the great principle of total abstinence from every thing that can intoxicate, as he ever was before.*" For the purpose of weighing this opinion correctly, we remark—first, the business of the reformation lies, in a very great measure, with *prejudiced* men, and *unbelievers*: secondly, Mr. Walworth's decision, in regard to what *will intoxicate* and what *will not*, must be carefully remembered. Under Mr. Walworth's construction, a man may rise from the perusal of these lectures, as good a friend, or better than before, to *that* principle of total abstinence, which teaches him, that he may rightfully use, as a beverage, any alcoholic liquor, provided it will not intoxicate. Now, I believe we have the issue: and, as claiming to be an old friend of the reformation, I utterly deny the correctness of this theory, and protest against it, in toto,—*ab ovo usque at mala.* Doubtless, many sincere and perfectly consistent friends of total abstinence may rise from the perusal, confirmed in their original principles, in the same way, that our notions of that, which is right, are often refreshed and confirmed, by a searching survey of that, which is wrong. I do not believe, that there is anything in these lectures, which will entirely neutralize the mischievous effect of the extracts, which have been presented in this letter. There is no deficiency of exhortation to total abstinence from something. There is no lack of eloquence or sweetness. The whole, in the language of the pharmacopolist, forms an "elegant preparation," but I fear the *alcoholic* will not be sufficiently neutralized, by the *saccharine* matter.

For the intentions of Dr. Nott, upon this and upon all other occasions, I entertain the highest respect. Whatever, in

the uprightness of his heart, he meant to express, it is impossible to deny, that, with all their eloquence, and all their learning, and all their gracefulness, and all their earnest exhortation to total abstinence, these lectures have produced a painful sensation in the temperance ranks. The defection of our venerable Mentor would have filled us all with sorrow. The wounds, inflicted upon our holy cause, from within and from without, are neither few nor far between. And some, I doubt not, have arisen from the perusal of these highly interesting lectures, with *tu quoque Brute!* upon their lips. The effect, upon my own mind, it is not easy to describe. Here then, thought I, here is one, whom I have revered; and from whom, when summoned to his high account, I could have anticipated, in relation to this glorious reformation, which he has contributed to uphold, by his eminent talents and lofty example, the dying words of the patriot, *esto perpetua!* turning aside, at the very last, and abandoning those principles, for which we have contended! It may not be denied, that the agreeable and obnoxious passages, in these lectures, alternated, in such an extraordinary manner, that, had their paternity been other than it is—had they been the production of some writer of low ambition, I should have charged him, in my heart, with a desire to stand well with all parties, and exchange his principle for popularity.

I remember to have heard of a parish, pretty equally composed of Orthodox and Unitarian members. They agreed, for the sake of economy, to combine, for the support of a clergyman. A man was found, of courteous and plausible manners. For his convenience, the pulpit was advanced considerably farther down the broad aisle than is customary. By some shrewd arrangement, or by accident—"*seu ratio dederit, seu fors objecerit illi*"—his Unitarian hearers were gathered very much on one side, and the Orthodox on the other. He became exceedingly popular. His exordium was commonly, like our almanacs, adapted to both meridians; and the body of his discourse was delivered *alternis versibus*

—a paragraph to the Unitarians, with his back to the Orthodox, and then a paragraph to the Orthodox, with his back to the Unitarians. He continued, for many years the spiritual guide of that united and happy people.

I recite this anecdote, to exhibit the strong impression, made upon my mind, by the seemingly contrasted sentiments, in these lectures; and not with the slightest intention of alluding in any but respectful terms to the venerable lecturer. The straight-forward and independent character of Dr. Nott is well known. The respect of the wise and the good is agreeable to most men. Like Lord Mansfield, he is desirous of that popularity, which follows him, and not of that, which he would be compelled to follow.

I have read Dr. Nott's reply to your criticism. As you say, it is long, and particular, perhaps necessarily so. Never did tired ear turn, more delightedly, from the complicated labors of Beethoven, to some sweet and simple air—nor the weary spirit, from the mazes of problematical theology, to the "conclusion of the whole matter; fear God and keep his commandments, for this is the whole duty of man"—than I from this prolonged correspondence, to these words of Dr. Nott, at the close of his reply—"I HOLD TO THE UTTER ABANDONMENT OF THE USE, AS A BEVERAGE, OF DISTILLED AND FERMENTED LIQUORS, OF EVERY SORT, ESPECIALLY OF WINES, WHETHER GOOD OR BAD, HAVING MUCH OR LITTLE ALCOHOL IN THEM." Here is one green spot—here is an oasis, on which you, and I, and the executive committee can sit down, and rejoice together, that our venerated friend cannot be lawfully claimed, as a patron or comforter of the wine-drinking "clergy and pious laity," to whom Mr. Walworth refers, nor of those who use *alcoholic* liquor of any kind, as a beverage. This is well, so far as it goes. And it is deeply to be deplored, that it may not go so far, as the lectures will go, and have gone already. *Dr. Nott* can no longer be misunderstood, though *his lectures* will, doubtless, continue to produce unsavory impressions, wherever they outrun the cor-

rective. I know no better reason for giving an extensive circulation to this letter, than because it affords a convenient vehicle for the conveyance of those words of truth and soberness, which we have quoted above. And now, my dear sir, I tender you my sincere thanks, as a friend of total abstinence, and as an officer of the American Temperance Union, for the course you have pursued; for I believe more firmly, in no common matter of fact, than I believe, had it not been for your action, Dr. Nott would have been claimed as authority, by the moderate drinkers of good wine and other fermented liquors, containing only a little alcohol.

With sincere respect,

I am faithfully yours,

L. M. SARGENT.